

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b>  <div style="text-align: center;"><b>Plaintiff,</b></div> <div style="text-align: center;"><b>vs.</b></div> <b>JAMES L. FARLEY,</b>  <div style="text-align: center;"><b>Defendant.</b></div>	) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) )	<b>8:05CR306</b>  <b>ORDER</b>
--	--	--------------------------------------

This matter is before the court on the motion for an extension of time by defendant James L. Farley (Farley) (Filing No. 20). Farley seeks until October 4, 2005, in which to file pretrial motions in accordance with the progression order (Filing No. 12). Farley's counsel represents that counsel for the government has no objection to the motion. Farley has filed an affidavit wherein he consents to the motion and acknowledges he understands the additional time may be excludable time for the purposes of the Speedy Trial Act (Filing No. 20). Upon consideration, the motion will be granted.

**IT IS ORDERED:**

Defendant Farley's motion for an extension of time (Filing No. 20) is granted. Defendant Farley is given until **on or before October 4, 2005**, in which to file pretrial motions pursuant to the progression order. The ends of justice have been served by granting such motion and outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The additional **time** arising as a result of the granting of the motion, i.e., the time between **September 20, 2005 and October 4, 2005**, shall be deemed **excludable** time in any computation of time under the requirement of the Speedy Trial Act for the reason defendant's counsel requires additional time to adequately prepare the case, taking into consideration due diligence of counsel, and the novelty and complexity of this case. The failure to grant additional time might result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B).

DATED this 20th day of September, 2005.

BY THE COURT:

s/Thomas D. Thalken  
United States Magistrate Judge